

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,365	05/15/2001	James E. Fox	RSW920010038US1	8757

7590 07/15/2004

Gerald R. Woods
IBM Corporation
Dept. T81/Bldg. 503
P.O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,365

Applicant(s)

FOX ET AL.

Examiner

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment A on 4/23/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 4/23/2004.
 2. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 10 are independent claims.
- This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1, 3-6, 9-10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaaskelainen, Jr. ("Jaaskelainen", US# 5,710,574) in view of Rosenberg et al. ("Rosenberg", US# 6,219,032).

As per independent claim 1, Jaaskelainen teaches a method of defining a widget displayable by a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

triggering an event associated with the widget (Jaaskelainen, Fig. 5B);

responsive to the event, selecting core and perimeter gravitational settings (Jaaskelainen, col. 8, lines 39-49); and

determining an effective force boundary circumscribing the widget as a function of the core and perimeter gravitational settings (Jaaskelainen, col. 8, lines 39-49).

Jaaskelainen fails to teach the limitations of selecting a mass associated with the widget, and consequently determining the force boundary circumscribing the widget as a function of the mass.

Rosenberg teaches a force feedback controlled cursor. The user can control the cursor, and other on screen objects disclosed by several settings and variables. One of those settings

Art Unit: 2174

includes the mass of the cursor (Rosenberg, col.35, lines 15-25). Rosenberg also teaches the ability to set the gravitational control of on screen objects (Rosenberg, col. 40, lines 60-68).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the quantified mass control system of Rosenberg in the widget control system of Jaaskelainen because it would provide the user with a more accurate and precise control over the properties of on screen widgets.

Independent claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of triggering includes:

activating a pop-up menu for selecting the mass (Jaaskelainen, col. 7, lines 46-47).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Jaaskelainen further teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising:

using a selection pointer to activate the pop-up menu (Jaaskelainen, col. 7, lines 23-28).

Dependent claims 9 and 13 are similar to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of triggering includes:

selecting the widget with a selection pointer while the widget is being displayed by the GUI (Jaaskelainen, col. 7, lines 48-58); and

clicking a mouse button to activate a pop-up menu for selecting the mass m (Jaaskelainen, col. 7, lines 46-48).

As per independent claim 6, Jaaskelainen teaches a computer system, comprising:

- a display (Jaaskelainen, Fig. 1);
- a graphical user interface (GUI) presented by the display (Jaaskelainen, Fig. 4);
- a widget, included in the GUI, having a user-selectable gravitational setting (Jaaskelainen, Fig. 5b; col. 8, lines 39-49);
- a selection mechanism permitting an end-user to select a details of the gravitational setting (Jaaskelainen, col. 8, lines 39-49); and
- means for defining an effective force boundary of the widget as a function of the gravitational setting (Jaaskelainen, col.8, lines 39-49).

Jaaskelainen fails to teach the limitations of selecting a mass associated with the widget, and consequently determining the force boundary circumscribing the widget as a function of the mass. Rosenberg teaches a force feedback controlled cursor. The user can control the cursor, and other on screen objects disclosed by several settings and variables. One of those settings includes the mass of the cursor (Rosenberg, col. 35, lines 15-25). Rosenberg also teaches the ability to set the gravitational control of on screen objects (Rosenberg, col. 40, lines 60-68).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the quantified mass control system of Rosenberg in the widget control system of Jaaskelainen because it would provide the user with a more accurate and precise control over the properties of on screen widgets.

5. Claims 2, 7-8, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaaskelainen and Rosenberg as applied to claims 1, 3-6, 9-10, and 13 above, and further in view of admitted prior art.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, the invention of Jaaskelainen and Rosenberg fails to teach the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining includes:

determining a mass M associated with a selection pointer displayable by the GUI; and

calculating the value $B = \sqrt{m/M}$, wherein B represents the effective force boundary.

However the admitted prior art teaches the well-known gravitational equation of $f = m/D^2$ (page 8, lines 18-22). The formula $B = \sqrt{m/M}$ is easily derived from $f = m/D^2$ by simple algebra and substitution.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the equation $B = \sqrt{m/M}$ to define the force boundary in the gravitational widget system of Jaaskelainen and Rosenberg because it would provide an accurate analog to the physical system of which it intends to simulate, that system being gravity.

Dependent claims 7 and 11 are similar to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Jaaskelainen further teaches the computer system of claim 7, further comprising:

means for determining the distance D between the center of the selection pointer and the center of the widget (Jaaskelainen, col. 8, lines 39-49);

comparison means for determining if the magnitude of the value of B is greater than or equal to D (Jaaskelainen, col. 8, lines 39-49); and

means for moving the selection pointer displayed by the GUI relative to the widget, responsive to the comparison means (Jaaskelainen, col. 8, lines 39-49).

Dependent claim 12 is similar to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments in the Amendment A have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicants argued the following:

(a) Nothing in either Jaaskelainen or Rosenberg to suggest how or why the teachings of those two references could be combined and how Rosenberg's reference to simulated mass would be relevant to the process of defining a GUI widget.

8. The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, both references teach a method of positioning a pointer within a GUI widget. However, Jaaskelainen does not teach the particular limitation of selecting a mass associated with a widget. Rosenberg does teach this limitation wherein a mass is associated with defining a GUI widget (col.45, lines 9-60; col.49, lines 58-67; col.56, lines 30-49). It would have been obvious to combine Rosenberg's teaching with Jaaskelainen in order for the user to accurately and efficiently control cursor movement (Rosenberg, col.2, lines 47-50).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (703) 305-0720. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-9915 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
June 30, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100